UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,885	01/05/2004	Gueorgui Bonov Chkodrov	5486-0250PUS1	2093

67321   7590   02/27/2009
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
PO Box 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
TIMBLIN, ROBERT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/750,885	CHKODROV ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ROBERT TIMBLIN	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 October 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *8-14 and 22-30* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *8-14 and 22-30* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 October 2008* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action corresponds to application 10/750,885 filed 1/5/2004.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/29/2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Applicant herein amends claims 8, 22, 29, and 30. Accordingly, claims 8-14 and 22-30 are currently pending.

Drawings

The drawings as presently submitted have been accepted and entered. The prior objection for placement of "Prior Art'" in figures 1-3 have been removed.

Specification

In accordance with Applicants statement on record (i.e. reply dated 10/29/2008, page 9), the computer-readable medium is seen to only include statutory embodiments

(i.e. precluding being defined by carrier waves, transmission media, etc) and further since, as described as a storage medium (i.e. "having stored thereon" as supported in the specification, top of page 7), can only be interpreted as a hardware medium.

Claim Objections

Examiner thanks Applicant for the correcting amendments addressing the prior claim objections for minor informalities for claims 22, 29, and 30. Respectfully, those objections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it relates to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the computing device and the units of the computing device in claim 29 may be construed as functional descriptive material composed of stored procedures (i.e. software per se). In other words, the computing device lacks the use of hardware in the claim as to make it a statutory machine. Furthermore, Applicant's published specification (paragraph 0025) states that the invention may be implemented using software. Without claiming the computing device as a hardware device, claim 29 is seen as software per se (i.e. functional descriptive material) and therefore is not statutory. See MPEP 2106.01.

In response to Applicant's remarks/amendments (dated 10/29/2008, page 10) Examiner respectfully disagrees that the amended portions of "wherein the instance database resides, at least partially, on a computer-readable memory or storage medium" is sufficient to overcome the 101 rejection. Specifically, as read, the memory now included is not necessarily or positively recited as *being a component of* the system. Rather, the computer-readable memory or storage medium is seen as a component *in use* with the system. In other words, the system remains as comprised as functional unites perceived as software units.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-14, and 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waldorf et al. ('Waldorf' hereafter; U.S. Patent Application 2002/0038228) in view of Campbell et al. ('Campbell' hereafter; U.S. Patent 6,856,970).

With respect to claim 8, Waldorf teaches A method for maintaining information about multiple instances of an activity related to a business process, comprising:

receiving process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) regarding the instances (figures 2a-2b, drawing references 206-212; e.g. instances and

activities of an instance) from each of a plurality of application programs (figure 1b,

drawing references 166, 170, and 174, also figure 10 showing an exemplary

embodiment of figure 1b);

receiving continuation data (figures 2b and 3, the fields of tables 208-212 as well

as 302-304. For example, ACTIVITY_ID in the process table correlates an activity with

a PROCESS_ID) regarding the instances (figures 2a-2b, drawing references 206-212;

e.g. instances and activities of an instance), the continuation data (tables of figures 2-3)

correlating (0055-0057), for each of the instances (0056, i.e. identifying instances of a

process), process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) for the

instance received from at least one of the application programs (figure 1b, drawing

references 166, 170, and 174) with process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g.

business process data) for the same instance received from at least another of the

application programs (figure 3 and drawing reference 240; e.g. an instance is correlated

with a respective application via field 332); and

inserting process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data)

for each of the instances (drawing reference 208) into instance database records (110

and figure 2b) based on the continuation data (tables of figures 2-3), wherein:

the instances (drawing reference 208) are acted upon in a sequence of

processing steps (drawing reference 248, 0006, 0057 and figs. 1b, 10), each of the

applications (figure 1b, drawing references 166, 170, and 174) provides process data

(figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) corresponding to a different

part of the processing sequence (0060; i.e. indicating a position for an activity within a

sequential process and fig. 10; e.g. information from a portal, credit agency and shipping warehouse describe a different part of an process of ordering goods), and

process data for at least a portion of the instances are received in an order different form the processing sequence (0016; e.g. when the activity is complete, the activity performing system acknowledges the status by writing a message to the queue teaches activities are written when completed and further, 0014, 0015, 0064; describe situations (i.e. delayed processing, network traffic, and disparate remote system) that may cause data to be entered out of order); and

wherein an out-of-order record (e.g. 208) is a record that contains data reflecting the completion of a processing step for an instance (258; e.g. stop timestamp indicating completion) but does not either contain or refer to currently existing data reflecting the completion of a sequentially prior processing step (e.g. with independent applications 1030-1050, fig. 10 submitting instance data, that data may come out of order) for the instance (0014-0016, 0064 describing unordered processing).

Waldorf does not appear to expressly teach preventing access to instance database records containing out-of-order data.

Campbell, however, teaches preventing access to instance database records containing out-of-order data (col. 13 line 25-32 and col. 17, line 42-47) to exclude the data that is in the process of being uploaded from view and enabling a user to see a record in its entirety when complete.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art (e.g. monitoring completion of a process) at the time of the present invention to combine the

teachings of the cited references because the system of Campbell would have given a user of Waldorf the ability to view complete data records for workflow analysis (needed by Waldorf, 0052). Such teachings of Campbell would have further given Waldorf complete and consistent records to analyze in order for an analyst to determine the "whole picture" of a business process (need suggested in Waldorf, 0010) rather than partial data which may compromise analysis.

With respect to claim 9, Campbell teaches the method of claim 8, wherein said preventing access comprises preventing human users from viewing instance database records containing out-of-order data (col. 17 line 23-41, Campbell).

With respect to claim 10, Campbell teaches the method of claim 8, wherein said preventing access comprises preventing one or more display or analysis application programs from performing display of or analysis upon records containing out-of-order data (col. 13 line 12-30).

With respect to claim 11 and similar claim 25, Campbell teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising:

providing access to a first instance database record for an instance not containing out-of-order data, and preventing access to a second instance database record for the instance, wherein the second instance database record contains out-of-

order data, and wherein process data in the second instance database record is not correlated to process data in the first record by continuation data (col. 13 line 32-36).

With respect to claim 12, Waldorf teaches the method of claim 11, further comprising:

receiving correlation data indicating that the first and second records pertain to the same instance; and merging the first and second records (0056 and figure 2A).

With respect to claim 13, Waldorf teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the process data is received in batch updates from the applications (0068).

With respect to claim 14, Waldorf teaches the method of claim 8, wherein:

process data from at least one of the applications is sequentially pre-sorted prior to batch update (0057 and drawing reference 248).

With respect to claim 22, Waldorf teaches A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a program for maintaining information about multiple instances of an activity related to a business process which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform steps comprising:

receiving process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) regarding multiple instances (0011) of an activity (drawing reference 210) from each of a plurality of application programs (figure 1B);

receiving continuation data (figures 2b and 3, the fields of tables 208-212 as well as 302-304. For example, ACTIVITY_ID in the process table correlates an activity of an instance with a PROCESS_ID) regarding the instances (figures 2a-2b, drawing references 206-212; e.g. instances and activities of an instance), the continuation data (tables of figures 2-3) correlating (0055-0057), for each of the instances (0056, i.e. identifying instances of a process), process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data), process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) for the instance received from at least one of the application programs (figure 1b, drawing references 166, 170, and 174) with process data for the same instance received from at least another of the application programs (figure 3 and drawing reference 240; e.g. an instance is correlated with a respective application via field 332);

and inserting process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) for each of the instances (drawing reference 208) into instance database records (110 and figure 2b) based on the continuation data (tables of figures 2-3), wherein: the instances are acted upon in a sequence of processing steps (drawing reference 248 and 0057), each of the applications (figure 1B) provides process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) corresponding to a different part of the processing sequence (0060; i.e. indicating a position for an activity within a sequential process and fig. 10; e.g. information from a portal, credit agency and shipping warehouse describe a different part of an process of ordering goods).

process data for at least a portion of the instances are received in an order different form the processing sequence (0016; e.g. when the activity is complete, the activity performing system acknowledges the status by writing a message to the queue teaches activities are written when completed and further, 0014, 0015, 0064; describe situations (i.e. delayed processing, network traffic, and disparate remote system) that may cause data to be entered out of order)

wherein an out-of-order record (e.g. 208) is a record that contains data reflecting the completion of a processing step for an instance (258; e.g. stop timestamp indicating completion) but does not either contain or refer to currently existing data reflecting the completion of a sequentially prior processing step (e.g. with independent applications 1030-1050, fig. 10 submitting instance data, that data may come out of order) for the instance (0014-0016, 0064 describing unordered processing).

Waldorf does not appear to expressly teach preventing access to instance database records containing out-of-order data.

Campbell, however, teaches preventing access to instance database records containing out-of-order data (col. 13 line 25-32 and col. 17, line 42-47) to exclude the data that is in the process of being uploaded from view and enabling a user to see a record in its entirety when complete.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art (e.g. monitoring completion of a process) at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the system of Campbell would have given a user of Waldorf the ability to view complete data records for workflow analysis (needed

by Waldorf, 0052). Such teachings of Campbell would have further given Waldorf complete and consistent records to analyze in order for an analyst to determine the "whole picture" of a business process (need suggested in Waldorf, 0010) rather than partial data which may compromise analysis.

With respect to claim 23, Campbell teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein said preventing access comprises preventing human users from viewing instance database records containing out-of-order data (col. 13 line 25-30).

With respect to claim 24, Campbell teaches he computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein said preventing access comprises preventing one or more display or analysis application programs from performing display of or analysis upon records containing out-of-order data (col. 13 line 12-30).

With respect to claim 26, Waldorf teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 25, comprising additional data representing sequences of instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform additional steps comprising:

receiving correlation data indicating that the first and second records pertain to the same instance and merging the first and second records (0056 and figure 2A).

With respect to claim 27, Waldorf teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein the process data is received in batch updates from the applications (0068).

With respect to claim 28, Waldorf teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein:

process data from at least one of the applications is sequentially pre-sorted prior to batch update (0057 and drawing reference 248).

With respect to claim 29, Waldorf teaches In a system having multiple application programs providing data with respect to activities related to particular instances of a business process to a process instance database, a computing device for managing the intake of and access to said data to and from said instance database, said computing device comprising:

a first receiving unit (0070; e.g. the system receiving from an application) to receive process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) regarding the instances (figures 2a-2b, drawing references 206-212; e.g. instances and activities of an instance) from each of a plurality of application programs (figure 1b, drawing references 166, 170, and 174);

a second receiving unit (110) to receive continuation data (figures 2b and 3, the fields of tables 208-212 as well as 302-304. For example, ACTIVITY_ID in the process table correlates an activity with a PROCESS_ID) regarding the instances (figures 2a-2b,

drawing references 206-212; e.g. instances and activities of an instance), the

continuation data (tables of figures 2-3) correlating (0055-0057), for each of the

instances (0056, i.e. identifying instances of a process), process data (figures 2a-b and

0047-0048; e.g. business process data) for the instance received from at least one of

the application programs (figure 1b, drawing references 166, 170, and 174) with

process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) for the same

instance received from at least another of the application programs (figure 3 and

drawing reference 240; e.g. an instance is correlated with a respective application via

field 332);

an inserting unit (figure 1B; i.e. the system inserts data into instance database

110) to insert process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) for

each of the instances (drawing reference 208) into instance database records (110 and

figure 2b) based on the continuation data (tables of figures 2-3), wherein the instance

database resides, at least partially, on a computer-readable memory storage medium

(0042);

a sequencing unit (0068; i.e. the system requests the activities in sequence) that

tracks and manages (0013) the incoming application data (figure 1b; i.e. date from

applications 166-174) for each instance so that it corresponds with a processing

sequence (248) that determines an order of steps defined by a process (0057)

ordering unit (248) that identifies process data for any instance that is received

in an order different from the processing sequence (0016; e.g. when the activity is

complete, the activity performing system acknowledges the status by writing a message

to the queue teaches activities are written when completed and further, 0014, 0015, 0064; describe situations (i.e. delayed processing, network traffic, and disparate remote system) that may cause data to be entered out of order)

wherein an out-of-order record (e.g. 208) is a record that contains data reflecting the completion of a processing step for an instance (258; e.g. stop timestamp indicating completion) but does not either contain or refer to currently existing data reflecting the completion of a sequentially prior processing step (e.g. with independent applications 1030-1050, fig. 10 submitting instance data, that data may come out of order) for the instance (0014-0016, 0064 describing unordered processing);

a correlating unit (figure 1, 110) that properly correlates database records of out-of-order processing data (figure 3 drawing reference 304 ; e.g. an In Table queue) for an instance (240) with the remaining processing data for that instance (0062, 0064; i.e. the In Table receives instance records as they are entered from the applications and therefore describes out-of-order data); and

a merging unit (130 and 0057; i.e. the accumulation of records of activities belonging to the same instance) that merges out-of-order processing data records for an instance with in-order processing data records (drawing reference 248) for an instance (0011 and 0080; i.e. the system 100 collects for the individual instances) where the in-order and out-of-order data records are correlated by said correlating unit (110; i.e. the instance database stores the instance data such as found in figure 2B).

Waldorf does not appear to teach a limiting unit that prevents access to instance database records containing out-of-order data.

Campbell, however, teaches a limiting unit (col. 13 line 26; i.e. a gatekeeper mechanism) that prevents access to instance database records containing out-of-order data (col. 13 line 25-32 and col. 17, line 42-47) to exclude the data that is in the process of being uploaded from view and enabling a user to see a record in its entirety when complete.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art (e.g. monitoring completion of a process) at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the system of Campbell would have given a user of Waldorf the ability to view complete data records for workflow analysis (needed by Waldorf, 0052). Such teachings of Campbell would have further given Waldorf complete and consistent records to analyze in order for an analyst to determine the "whole picture" of a business process (need suggested in Waldorf, 0010) rather than partial data which may compromise analysis.

With respect to claim 30, Waldorf teaches A method for maintaining information about multiple instances, of an activity related to a business process, comprising:

receiving process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) regarding the instances (figures 2a-2b, drawing references 206-212; e.g. instances and activities of an instance) from each of a plurality of application programs (figure 1b, drawing references 166, 170, and 174);

receiving continuation data (figures 2b and 3, the fields of tables 208-212 as well as 302-304. For example, ACTIVITY_ID in the process table correlates an activity with

a PROCESS_ID) regarding the instances (figures 2a-2b, drawing references 206-212;

e.g. instances and activities of an instance), the continuation data (tables of figures 2-3)

correlating (0055-0057), for each of the instances (0056, i.e. identifying instances of a

process), process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data) for the

instance received from at least one of the application programs (figure 1b, drawing

references 166, 170, and 174) with process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g.

business process data) for the same instance received from at least another of the

application programs (figure 3 and drawing reference 240; e.g. an instance is correlated

with a respective application via field 332); and

inserting process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data)

for each of the instances (drawing reference 208) into instance database records (110

and figure 2b) based on the continuation data (tables of figures 2-3), wherein each

instance database record comprises a primary key (240), a timestamp field for when the

data was received (256), a field noting the geographical origin of the data (254 and

0058; i.e. the Who field may indicate the application which made the entry. Figure 10

shows the multiple applications (1030-1050) and their locations that may be included in

that field), a field noting the size of the data (242), a field noting the time the data was

collected (0055), and field noting the time the data was transmitted (0068; e.g. then the

activity was requested), and further wherein:

the instances (drawing reference 208) are acted upon in a sequence of

processing steps (drawing reference 248 and 0057), each of the applications (figure 1b)

provides process data (figures 2a-b and 0047-0048; e.g. business process data)

corresponding to a different part of the processing sequence (0060; i.e. indicating a position for an activity within a sequential process)

process data for at least a portion of the instances are received in an order different from the processing sequence (0016; e.g. when the activity is complete, the activity performing system acknowledges the status by writing a message to the queue teaches activities are written when completed and further, 0014, 0015, 0064; describe situations (i.e. delayed processing, network traffic, and disparate remote system) that may cause data to be entered out of order); and

wherein an out-of-order record (e.g. 208) is a record that contains data reflecting the completion of a processing step for an instance (258; e.g. stop timestamp indicating completion) but does not either contain or refer to currently existing data reflecting the completion of a sequentially prior processing step (e.g. with independent applications 1030-1050, fig. 10 submitting instance data, that data may come out of order) for the instance (0014-0016, 0064 describing unordered processing) and further wherein said out-of-order data records have not been correlated (e.g. figure 3) with the appropriate existing data records, said out-of-order records being similarly comprised to said instance database records (fig. 2b) and said out-of-order records having their data merged (0016, e.g. use of a data queue) with existing records and then being deleted as part of said correlation process (0073; i.e. removing the instance after the activity is complete).

Waldorf does not appear to expressly teach preventing access to instance database records containing out-of-order data.

Campbell, however, teaches preventing access to instance database records containing out-of-order data (col. 13 line 25-32 and col. 17, line 42-47) to exclude the data that is in the process of being uploaded from view and enabling a user to see a record in its entirety when complete.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art (e.g. monitoring completion of a process) at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the system of Campbell would have given a user of Waldorf the ability to view complete data records for workflow analysis (needed by Waldorf, 0052). Such teachings of Campbell would have further given Waldorf complete and consistent records to analyze in order for an analyst to determine the "whole picture" of a business process (need suggested in Waldorf, 0010) rather than partial data which may compromise analysis.

Response to Arguments

Response to 101 rejections can be found in the appropriate section above.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the present claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Under a new interpretation of the previously applied Waldorf and Campbell references, Examiner submits these references combined teach the claims as amended.

Summarily, in the endeavor of process flow management and analysis, Waldorf appears to teach process instances (0006, and figs 1b, 10; e.g. credit card verification, shipping information) that are written to the management system when complete (e.g. 0016, Waldorf). Waldorf further teaches an input queue receiving completion information (figs 2b and 3), to further suggest that instances are recorded *as completed* and thus in no specific order (i.e. to comprise an out-of-order record). Moreover, Examiner submits that Waldorf teaches several indications in which processes (e.g. recording and sending a completion message) may be delayed and thus received out-of-order at the management system. For example, Waldorf teaches desperate, remote computer systems (0014, figure 10), network traffic (0014), and data formatting (0035), which all may cause latency of recording completion data. Thus, in an instance of the above example, Examiner submits (referring to figure 10) that disparate systems communicating to the process monitor located in San Diego could receive completion data from a shipping warehouse in Seattle before receiving completion information from a credit agency in New York. Further, by these locations sending completion data independently, and thus no specific order, Waldorf teaches a process monitoring system recording data in no particular order (i.e. recording shipping warehouse information while not yet receiving credit agency information).

In accordance with the above, Campbell is best seen to teach preventing access to the aforementioned out-of-order (e.g. inconsistent) record (disclosed by Waldorf) in order to provide Waldorf with consistent and complete records to analyze.

Examiner also notes Applicant's arguments appear to be arguing limitations not explicitly found in the claim:

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., p. 11 of the reply; "Campbell does not teach or suggest a way of handing the relationship between application data from a particular point in a sequence, and application data from sequentially prior steps that may be either missing or yet incomplete") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Specifically, the claims to not appear to clearly recite limitations such as "handing the relationship application data from a particular point in a sequence" and further prior steps that may be "missing" or "incomplete." In the latter, Examiner submits that Campbell is argued as not restricting access to already uploaded data that either does not contain, or references *currently missing,* however, the claim states preventing access... to "currently existing" data.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 5,924,103 to Ahmed et al. The subject matter disclosed therein pertains to the pending claims (i.e. preventing access to incomplete data, e.g. col. 2 line 5-18).

U.S. Patent Application 2002/0170035 to Casati et al. The subject matter disclosed therein pertains to the pending claims (i.e. workflow management and instance data).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Timblin whose telephone number is 571-272-5627. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ROBERT TIMBLIN/
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167